

# Assessing Potential Wind Energy Resources in Saudi Arabia with a Skew- $t$ Distribution

Felipe Tagle<sup>1</sup>, Stefano Castruccio<sup>1</sup>, Paola Crippa<sup>2</sup> and Marc G. Genton<sup>3</sup>

March 14, 2017

## Abstract

Facing increasing domestic energy consumption from population growth and industrialization, Saudi Arabia is aiming to reduce its reliance on fossil fuels and to broaden its energy mix by expanding investment in renewable energy sources, including wind energy. A preliminary task in the development of wind energy infrastructure is the assessment of wind energy potential, a key aspect of which is the characterization of its spatio-temporal behavior. In this study we examine the impact of internal climate variability on seasonal wind power density fluctuations using 30 simulations from the Large Ensemble Project (LENS) developed at the National Center for Atmospheric Research. Furthermore, a spatio-temporal model for daily wind speed is proposed with neighbor-based cross-temporal dependence, and a multivariate skew- $t$  distribution to capture the spatial patterns of higher order moments. The model can be used to generate synthetic time series over the entire spatial domain that adequately reproduces the internal variability of the LENS dataset.

**Some key words:** daily wind speed, internal climate variability, skew- $t$  distribution, wind power density

**Short title:** Assessing Potential Wind Energy Resources

---

<sup>1</sup>School of Mathematics & Statistics, Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 7RU United Kingdom. E-mail: felipe.tagle-soler@ncl.ac.uk, stefano.castruccio@ncl.ac.uk

<sup>2</sup>School of Civil Engineering & Geosciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU United Kingdom. E-mail: paola.crippa@ncl.ac.uk

<sup>3</sup>CEMSE Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal 23955-6900, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: marc.genton@kaust.edu.sa

This publication is based upon work supported by the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) Office of Sponsored Research (OSR) under Award No: OSR-2015-CRG4-2640.

# 1 Introduction

Wind energy has become an important component of energy portfolios for many developed and developing nations worldwide. This trend is largely driven by technological advances that enable more efficient harnessing of available wind energy and its integration into energy transmission networks, but is also due to growing recognition of the importance of renewable energy sources in climate change mitigation strategies (Bruckner et al., 2014; Zhu and Genton, 2012, and references therein). For instance, Denmark relies on wind energy for nearly 40% of its domestic energy consumption, and this number is expected to rise to 50% by 2020 (DEA, 2016). In 2015, China added 33 GW of new installed capacity, to reach a total capacity of 148 GW, representing an increase of 29% (WWEA, 2016). These and other examples provide convincing evidence that wind energy offers a viable alternative to traditional fossil fuel-based energy sources, and are paving the way for other nations to exploit this renewable and clean energy resource.

Saudia Arabia, with its vast oil reserves, has a long tradition of relying solely on fossil fuels for its energy needs. However, faced with rising energy demands due to population growth and industrialization, it is actively seeking to diversify its energy mix by expanding its renewable energy portfolio to 54 GW by 2032, of which 9 GW will come from wind power (KA-CARE, 2012). Due to the inherent variability and limited predictability of the wind resource, assessing its spatial and temporal characteristics is a critical step in the development of wind energy infrastructure. Several studies have sought to quantify the wind potential over Saudi Arabia (e.g. Rehman and Ahmad, 2004; Rehman et al., 2007; Shaahid et al., 2014), however, these have mostly focused on just a few locations, largely due to the country's sparse observational network. A recent study by Yip et al. (2016) used reanalysis data to provide a more comprehensive assessment, which in addition to evaluating the abundance of the wind resource over the Arabian Peninsula, also investigated its variability and intermittency, as these pose the greatest challenges to the integration of wind energy into existing power grid systems. In this study, as part of an on-

going collaborative effort with the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), we focus on the spatio-temporal characteristics of this resource over Saudi Arabia. Wind speeds fluctuate over a wide range of frequencies, with those of the order of days governed by general weather patterns, while shorter frequencies are driven by local effects and turbulence (Pinson, 2013). Our focus is on very low frequencies, where long-term wind trends and the effects of human activities may potentially play a role. In particular, this is the first study that investigates the sensitivity of wind energy potential to internal climate variability, that is, the variability that is intrinsic to the climate system due to the complex interactions between its components at various temporal and spatial scales. Only recently has this source of variability been properly identified in the geophysical community (i.e. Deser et al., 2012, 2014), and its impact is just beginning to be understood. Because of the decadal timescales at which this source of variability operates, the characterization of its impact usually relies on simulations from Earth System Models (ESMs), which, in addition to solving the atmospheric governing equations, include processes from other components of the climate system, namely, land, ocean and sea ice; and so are well-suited to represent the complex interactions that occur at such timescales. In this work we use a collection of simulations based on the Community Earth System Model (CESM), developed at NCAR under the Large Ensemble Project (LENS) that are specifically designed to isolate the effects of internal climate variability. These simulations and ESM simulations in general, however, are computationally expensive to run, and many simulations are necessary to properly quantify the effects of natural variability. An alternative to simulating atmospheric processes using these models is provided by stochastic weather generators (Wilks and Wilby, 1999; Ailliot et al., 2015a) or climate emulators, which are statistical models designed to generate synthetic sequences of meteorological variables whose statistical properties closely resemble those of the observational datasets on which they are trained. We develop one such model designed to capture the natural variability of daily wind speed in Saudi Arabia, that may be used, among other applications, to assess future wind energy potential under different climate scenarios.

Stochastic weather generators are widely used in applications ranging from agricultural models to climate impact studies. In fact, they have been used by the energy industry to generate short temporal frequency simulations of wind data, to assist utilities in the balancing of uncertain loads and supplies (Hering et al., 2015). In Ailliot and Monbet (2012), a model of this kind was used to generate wind time series at different meteorological stations near potential wind farm sites to assess various quantities related to wind power production. Most of these stochastic wind generators have focused on single-site models, and typically use Markov chains to describe the temporal dependence on different wind regimes (Ailliot et al., 2006). Recently, focus has shifted towards a multisite framework, which poses the challenge of having to explicitly account for the complex cross-correlation patterns among neighboring sites (Bessac et al., 2015; Hering et al., 2015; Bessac et al., 2016). Thus, the number of sites under consideration is usually limited, as the quality of fit quickly deteriorates as the quantity increases (Hering et al., 2015). The model presented here, however, with the approximately  $1^\circ$  horizontal resolution of the LENS dataset, is applied to a 148-point spatial domain; and with a temporal coverage spanning more than 80 years, results in a spatio-temporal domain of nearly 5 million data points.

Environmental data often exhibit departures from Gaussianity, such as skewness and heavy tails. Traditionally, to continue exploiting the appealing properties of the normal distribution and the well-developed theory of Gaussian processes, a transformation is usually applied to the data; e.g. a square root transformation (Gneiting, 2002), a power transformation (Ailliot et al., 2015b; Bessac et al., 2016) or a Gaussian copula (Hering et al., 2015). Only recently have there been studies that exploit the flexibility of skew-elliptical distributions, of which the skew- $t$  (Azzalini and Capitanio, 2003) and the skew-normal (Azzalini, 2005) distributions are special cases that directly address the skewness and excess kurtosis that are commonly found in wind data. For example, Hering and Genton (2010) developed a short-term wind speed forecasting model using a bivariate skew- $t$  distribution, while Flecher et al. (2010) used a closed skew-normal distribution (González-Farías et al., 2004) as part of a multivariate weather generator. This fam-

ily of distributions represents an extension of the normal model and retains several of its convenient properties, such as closure under conditioning and marginalization (see Genton (2004) or Azzalini and Capitanio (2014) for an overview of the theory and applications). The stochastic wind generator that we have developed is based on the skew- $t$  distribution, and we find that it adequately captures regional spatial correlations and temporal autocorrelations.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the daily wind speed data used for the training and validation of the spatio-temporal model described in Section 3. Section 4 provides an assessment of the temporal variability of the wind energy resource in Saudi Arabia, and Section 5 offers a discussion and conclusion.

## 2 Wind Data

We consider daily wind speed in Saudi Arabia from the publicly available LENS dataset developed at NCAR (Kay et al., 2015). The ensemble consists of 30 fully-coupled simulations, based on CESM version 1, with the Community Atmosphere Model (CAM), version 5, run at approximately  $1^\circ$  horizontal resolution in all model components. The simulations span from the year 1920 to 2100, with radiative forcing following the CMIP5 protocol; namely, historical forcing from 1920 to 2005, and the representative concentration pathway 8.5 (RCP8.5) from 2006 to 2100. Each simulation represents a unique climate trajectory, generated by introducing small round-off level differences into their initial atmospheric conditions. For this study we use the historical segment (1920-2005) of 30 ensemble members over Saudi Arabia, bounded roughly by  $15\text{-}32^\circ\text{N}$  and  $35\text{-}55^\circ\text{E}$ , which at the noted horizontal resolution corresponds to  $n=148$  points, in the temporal dimension  $N=31,390$  points, resulting in nearly 5 million data points.

In order to illustrate the diverse wind regimes across Saudi Arabia, we examine the various shapes of the annual cycle, as represented by the LENS ensemble mean. Figure 1 displays the annual cycles for five locations that broadly capture the variety of regimes. The seasonal patterns can be interpreted with the aid of the mean monthly wind fields (Fig. S.1 in the supplementary

material), constructed from the lowest level zonal and meridional winds (UBOT and VBOT, respectively) obtained from the LENS database. The Arabian Peninsula lies within the trade-wind belt (Hadley cell) of the Northern Hemisphere. During winter, westerlies from the Mediterranean travel southward towards the Persian Gulf (Shamal trade winds), and turn south and southwest through the Rub al-Khali Desert toward Yemen. But beginning in spring, the northerly winds intensify, and the onset of the monsoon circulation from the Indian Ocean induces a southeasterly flow along the southeastern part of the peninsula and the Arabian Sea, into the Rub al-Khali Desert. As a result, the mild easterly flow over Point 3, located east of the Asir Mountains, becomes strongly westerly during the summer, explaining the maximum daily wind speed during this season. Moreover, the low speeds in March and September, correspond to the transitions between easterly and westerly flow, characterized by strong wind convergence. Despite their distance, Points 2 and 4 display a similar pattern, with dual peaks arising in early spring and the middle of summer, largely due to the intensification of the northerly winds during the monsoon season. The temporal pattern over Point 5, close to the eastern coast, most clearly reflects the second intensification of the Shamal trade winds during May and June. The mountainous region




Figure 1: (a) Selection of points over Saudi Arabia with colors showing the elevation in meters, and their respective (b) daily wind speed annual cycles, computed as the mean annual cycle from the LENS. Wind speed data is based on the 1920-2005 output.

on the eastern coast of the peninsula, as represented by Point 1, displays a dampened annual cycle, reflecting the effect of the complex orography.

### 3 Model Description

#### 3.1 Spatio-temporal model

Let  $\mathbf{W}_{t,r} = (W_{1,t,r}, \dots, W_{n,t,r})^\top$  denote the  $n$ -vector of daily wind speeds over the domain at day  $t$ , in realization  $r$ . We propose a model of the form

$$\mathbf{W}_{t,r} = \mathbf{a}_{0,t} + \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{W}_{t-1,r} + \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{W}_{t-2,r} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t,r} \quad t = 3, \dots, N, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_{0,t} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_t - \mathbf{A}_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t-1} - \mathbf{A}_2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t-2}$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t$  representing the seasonal effect at time  $t$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , are  $n \times n$  coefficient matrices and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t,r}$  corresponds to the time  $t$  innovations of the  $r$ -th realization. The intercept term  $\mathbf{a}_{0,t}$  and the coefficient matrices are common to each realization  $r$ , while the distinct trajectories are the result of the iid innovations. This is consistent with the construction of the LENS and with atmospheric flow more generally; the initial condition memory is lost within a few weeks, after which each ensemble member evolves chaotically, as if driven by random atmospheric fluctuations (Kay et al., 2015). In order to assess whether fitting the model to a few realizations is sufficient to capture the variability across the LENS, the model in (1) is fit to time series belonging to three members chosen arbitrarily, under the above assumption of iid realizations.

The seasonal effect  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_t$  is estimated by regressing the time series of daily wind speed at each gridpoint on a small set of harmonics. In particular, we consider frequencies with 1 to 5 cycles per year, and choose the three with the highest power based on the associated periodogram.

Temporal dependence is introduced through a vector-autoregressive (VAR) model, which is commonly used in stochastic wind generators (e.g. Hering et al., 2015; Ailliot et al., 2006; Bessac et al., 2016). As is obvious from its specification, estimation of the coefficient matrices becomes difficult as the dimension of the multivariate process grows. Parametric models for

off-diagonal elements based on the distance between sites or shrinkage methods for reducing elements to zero have been proposed to address this issue (Monbet and Ailliot, 2017). Here the gridded nature of the spatial domain naturally suggests a nearest-neighbor specification. We find that a first-order stencil neighborhood scheme for  $\mathbf{A}_1$  and a diagonal form for  $\mathbf{A}_2$  adequately represents the temporal and cross-temporal structure. Figure 2 displays the estimates for the diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{A}_1$  and  $\mathbf{A}_2$ . The estimates of the  $\mathbf{A}_1$  are consistently positive along the edges of the domain, with values exceeding 0.6 over some coastal areas. Near the center, where negative values arise, it is usually the case that a neighboring site within the stencil, in the direction where advection is predominant, attains a positive value comparable in magnitude to those of the edges. Those of  $\mathbf{A}_2$ , however, are consistently negative, and even more so in the Eastern Province.




Figure 2: Estimates for the diagonal elements of the autoregressive matrices (a)  $\mathbf{A}_1$  and (b)  $\mathbf{A}_2$ ; all statistically significant at 1%.

The last step before fitting the multivariate skew- $t$  distribution to the VAR(2) residuals is the removal of any second-order seasonal variation. We do so at each gridpoint by regressing the standard deviation to a set of harmonics for each calendar day over all years, proceeding identically as in the case  $\mu_t$  (see Fig. S.2 of the supplementary material). Accordingly, the inno-

vation  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t,r}$  (henceforth we drop the subscript  $r$  for convenience) can be expressed as  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = \mathbf{S}_t \boldsymbol{\eta}_t$ , with  $\mathbf{S}_t$  being a diagonal matrix containing the time  $t$  standard deviation terms. By construction we have  $E(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t) = \mathbf{0}$ , and  $E(\boldsymbol{\eta}_t \boldsymbol{\eta}_t^\top) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta$ , a correlation matrix which we assume to be time-invariant. With a domain of this extent, containing a wide range of wind regimes, the assumption of stationarity is unreasonable. Several approaches have been advocated in the statistical literature to deal with non-stationary spatial covariance structures, beginning with the seminal work of Sampson and Guttorp (1992) and their spatial deformation approach. More recently, other approaches based on spatially-weighted combinations of stationary spatial covariance functions (Fuentes, 2001; Fuentes and Smith, 2001) and process convolutions (Higdon, 1998; Paciorek and Schervish, 2006) have received particular attention (see Sampson (2010) for a review). Here we partition the spatial domain into regions where the assumption of stationarity is plausible; i.e. we divide the vector  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$  into  $n_c$  subvectors,  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t = (\boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,t}^\top, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{n_c,t}^\top)^\top$ , where each  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{c,t}$ , composed of  $d_c$  number of gridpoints, is designed to capture regional features. We use Ward’s hierarchical clustering method to partition the domain, as it tends to produce clusters of approximately equal size (Everitt et al., 2011). Nine regions (Fig. 3) result in cluster sizes that are suitable for parameter estimation. The clustering of spatial locations has a long history in environmental applications (Wilks, 2011). Recently, Lorente-Plazas et al. (2015) used a combination of hierarchical and non-hierarchical techniques to cluster wind station data collected in the Iberian Peninsula. In the Markov regime-switching literature, clustering is often performed along the temporal dimension to identify different weather regimes (Kazor and Hering, 2015).

Each  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{c,t}$  is assumed to follow an independent multivariate skew- $t$  distribution, based on the formulation of Azzalini and Capitanio (2003) given its analogous derivation to the familiar Student- $t$  distribution, as opposed to others such as that of Branco and Dey (2001); see Azzalini et al. (2016) for a comparison of these formulations. A  $d$ -dimensional random variable  $\mathbf{Z}$  follows a multivariate skew- $t$  distribution, denoted by  $ST_d(\boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \nu)$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$  being a location  $d$ -vector,  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$  a  $d \times d$  scale matrix,  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  a  $d$ -vector skewness parameter, and  $\nu$  being the degrees of




Figure 3: (a) Nine regions used in the fitting of the innovation process  $\eta_t$ , defined using Ward's method, an agglomerative method that minimizes the sum of squared Euclidean distances between the points and the centroids of their respective cluster. Here each point corresponds to the  $N$ -dimensional vector of rescaled VAR(2) residuals. The (b) skewness and (c) kurtosis coefficients have been added as visual guides to help explain the regional shapes.

freedom, if it has a probability density of the form

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = 2t_d(\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\xi}; \boldsymbol{\Omega}, \nu) T \left( \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \boldsymbol{\omega}^{-1} (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\xi}) \sqrt{\frac{\nu + d}{\nu + Q(\mathbf{z})}}; \nu + d \right), \quad (2)$$

with  $Q(\mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\xi})^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega} (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\xi})$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \text{diag}(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_d) > 0$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \boldsymbol{\omega} \bar{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ ,  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}$  a  $d \times d$  correlation matrix,  $t_d(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\Omega}, \nu)$  is the probability density of the  $d$ -dimensional Student- $t$  distribution, and  $T(\cdot; \nu)$  denotes the cumulative distribution function of a univariate Student- $t$  distribution with  $\nu$  degrees of freedom.

### 3.2 Inference

One of the drawbacks of the parameterization used in (2), called the *direct parameterization* (DP), is that its parameters are not easy to interpret, as there is no simple relationship between them and the moments or cumulants of the distribution (Arellano-Valle and Azzalini, 2013). This is most readily apparent in the location parameter  $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ , which bears no resemblance to typical centrality measures such as the mean or median. This is problematic also for inference, as the reductions in the parameter space that usually accompany assumptions such as a mean zero and a variance one do not materialize under this parameterization, as both the mean and the variance

are functions of all of the above parameters (see Appendix). A centered parameterization (CP) based on the moments of the distribution was developed by Azzalini (1985) for the DP of the skew-normal distribution; partly to offer a more intuitive parameterization, but more importantly, to respond to the singularity of its associated information matrix at  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{0}$ , which does not apply to the skew- $t$  distribution. Recently, Arellano-Valle and Azzalini (2013) extended this CP to the skew- $t$  distribution. In the univariate setting, with the skew- $t$  DP given by  $(\xi, \omega^2, \alpha, \nu)$ , the CP corresponds to the four centered moments  $(\mu, \sigma^2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ , where  $\gamma_1$  refers to the skewness coefficient and  $\gamma_2$  is the coefficient of excess kurtosis. Of course, an implicit assumption in the CP is that these moments exist, requiring that  $\nu > 4$ , which may not hold in practice. Furthermore, the exact value of  $\nu$  imposes constraints on the feasible space of  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  (see Fig. 1 in Arellano-Valle and Azzalini (2013)); but this is not of concern here, given the values that apply to our data. In the multivariate case, the first two components of the CP are the familiar mean vector and the covariance matrix,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ , while the skewness term,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1$ , consists of the vector of marginal skewness coefficients. The kurtosis term corresponds to the Mardia index of multivariate kurtosis (Appendix), denoted by  $\gamma_2^M$ .

Because the singularity at  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \mathbf{0}$ , which characterizes the skew-normal likelihood, is lacking here, maximization of the skew- $t$  likelihood is often the method of choice to conduct parameter inference. However, we find that when maximizing the log-likelihood to each set of residuals, the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) tends to favor a more precise representation of the correlation structure at the expense of the marginal structure. This is not acceptable for our current application, which places a strong emphasis on the accurate representation of the marginal structure given the sensitivity of wind power density to wind speed. We considered adding a penalization term to the likelihood to constrain the optimization towards an improved marginal fit, but we obtained better results with a method of moments approach based on the above CP, as it afforded us greater control in isolating the fitting of the marginal structure from that of the spatial dependence. More specifically, using the CP gave us the possibility to directly impose

the condition that  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$  and that  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  is a correlation matrix for each region, thereby reducing the CP parameter space. Furthermore, we assumed that  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  is parameterized by  $\mathcal{M}(\phi, \kappa)$ , with  $\mathcal{M}$  being a Matérn correlation function with range parameter  $\phi$  and smoothness  $\kappa$ , which was fit by ordinary least-squares (OLS). Good agreement was found for each region between the sample estimates of correlation between the rescaled VAR(2) residuals and the corresponding value from the OLS-estimated Matérn correlation function (not shown). The construction of the  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1$  vector naturally suggests the use of sample estimates of the skewness coefficients at each gridpoint. Similarly, the kurtosis coefficient,  $\gamma_2^M$ , is assigned its sample estimate, which requires both  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$  (Appendix). Although the mapping from DP to CP is available in closed-form, the inverse map is not, and so it must be computed numerically. In fact, only the mapping  $(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1, \gamma_2^M) \mapsto (\boldsymbol{\delta}, \nu)$  needs to be specified, since the rest of the DP parameterization follows directly from these parameters and those of the CP parameters. We use the algorithm implemented in the `sn` package (Azzalini, 2016), which seeks the  $(d+1)$ -vector  $(\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top, \nu)$  that minimizes the  $\ell^2$ -distance between  $(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \nu)^\top, \gamma_2^M(\boldsymbol{\delta}, \nu))$  and its CP counterparts. As is common with many numerical optimization problems, finding a global maximum, or minimum in this case, is not guaranteed. In the few regions where such a situation arises, i.e. the  $\ell^2$ -distance does not vanish, the distance between the point in the DP space suggested by the algorithm and the optimal DP, as measured by the difference between the associated CP and the original CP, is sufficiently small to be of no concern.

### 3.3 Model validation

In order to assess the performance of the model in simulating realistic realizations of the daily surface wind speed over Saudi Arabia, the model was fit to three ensemble members, and 30 realizations were generated. Figure 4(a-d) show the mean autocorrelation function (ACF) for the 30 realizations and 30 LENS members, for four of the five representative points displayed in Fig. 1, as the ACF for Point 4 is quite similar to that of Point 2, and so is excluded. The realizations adequately reproduce this feature of the LENS data, despite the marked differences

among the autocorrelation structures across the various points. In particular, the ACFs in Points 1 and 2 drop sharply beyond the first few lags, whereas Point 3, which is in a region where both the northerly Shamal trade winds and southerly summer monsoon winds interact, shows a temporal dependence that remains relevant up to the 100-day lag.




Figure 4: (a-d) Average autocorrelation functions of 30 realizations of daily wind speed of (red) the proposed model and (black) the LENS, for Points 1, 2, 3 and 5 indicated in Fig. 1. Dotted red and dashed black lines represent the maximums and minimums of the simulated and LENS values, respectively, at each lag. A horizontal dashed blue line has been placed at zero. (e-h) Mean quantile-quantile plots of the daily surface wind speed for the LENS and the 30 model realizations, for the same points.

A comparison of the agreement between wind speed distributions is displayed across Fig. 4(e-h). The mean quantile-quantile (QQ) plots of the first three points show very good agreement between the simulated distributions and the LENS. Slight discrepancies emerge in the lower quantiles, most notably in Point 5 where even negative wind speeds are simulated, but this is a common drawback of models that do not have mechanisms in place to ensure non-negative values of the stochastic process (Ailliot and Monbet, 2012). Note that the discrepancies occur below the 2 m/s level, wind speeds at which common wind turbines would be idle, and thus can be disregarded for the purposes of our application. Of critical importance is the upper tail and

the fit in all four cases is acceptable.

Another common validation criteria for wind generators is the assessment of the distributions of excursion durations above or below some fixed threshold. As in Ailliot and Monbet (2012), we use the 25% and 75% quantiles of daily wind speed, but specifically for the months of January and July, respectively, in order to focus on the persistence when wind speeds are generally at their climatological lows and highs. Figure 5 displays the average log-survivor functions of the excursions below and above the 25% and 75% quantiles, respectively, for each of the above four points. It illustrates the strong variation in persistence across the domain and between the excursion types. For instance, at Point 1, which has fairly stable temporal characteristics throughout the year, the log-survivor functions are nearly identical for excursions both above the upper and below the lower thresholds, and of relatively low persistence, as little probability mass is assigned to excursions longer than 10 days. In contrast, at Point 5, these functions are notably different, as the low-threshold excursions tend to not exceed 8 days in length, while the




Figure 5: Average log-survivor functions of excursion durations of daily wind speeds (a-d) below the January average 25% quantile and (e-h) above the July 75% quantile. The functions corresponding to the LENS are denoted in black, and those of the 30 generated time series in red. Dashed lines represent the maximum and minimum, at each excursion length, of the respective log-survivor functions.

high-threshold can be as long as 20 days. Because we have assumed time-invariant autoregressive coefficients in (1), the realizations generate log-survivor functions that are similar across both excursion types, which explains the good agreement between those of the LENS at Point 1. At Point 3, despite the similarity in the LENS log-survivor functions, the degree of persistence is underestimated in both excursion cases, and at Point 5, the disagreement is more severe, as the realizations tend to overestimate the low-threshold excursion lengths, while underestimating those exceeding the high-threshold.

## 4 Wind Energy in Saudi Arabia

The average wind speed or wind power density (WPD) at measurement height or adjusted-to-hub height is frequently used in assessments of wind energy potential. WPD refers to the wind power that is available per unit area, and is given by  $\frac{1}{2}\rho w^3$ , where  $\rho$  represents the air density and  $w$  is the wind speed. Several methods exist for extrapolating near surface wind measurements to heights at which wind turbines operate (Emeis, 2012). Here we use the power law method, which assumes that the vertical wind profile at height  $z$  is given by  $w(z) = w(z_r)(z/z_r)^a$ , where  $z_r$  is a reference height and  $a$  is the power law exponent, which depends on the surface roughness and the thermal stability of the boundary layer. Typically,  $z_r$  represents the height at which observations are available. While the recommended value of  $a$  varies according to the surface type, it is frequently fixed at  $1/7$ ; this value has been found to be appropriate over open land surfaces, under neutral atmospheric stability and where the difference between the reference height and the height of interest  $z$  is less than 50 meters. Since this value has been used in other wind studies in this region (e.g. Rehman et al., 2007) and the coarse resolution of the LENS dataset already limits the representativeness of our estimates, we use  $a = 1/7$  henceforth.

Our computation of WPD starts with surface wind speed, defined in the LENS dataset as the wind speed at the lowest model layer (variable ZBOT in the database), which is then extrapolated to an 80-meter height using the above power law formula. The value of air density is assumed

to be constant across space and time, and equal to  $1.225 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$ . Given the general increase in wind speeds during spring and summer, we focus on the March-April-May (MAM) and June-July-August (JJA) WPD seasonal averages, which are derived from daily WPD estimates. The mean MAM WPD averages approximately  $30 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  across Saudi Arabia, and it increases to  $33 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  during JJA, particularly along the northern coast of the Persian Gulf and west of the Asir Mountains, reflecting the strengthening of the northerly Shamal trade winds and the southerly monsoon winds, respectively (Fig. S.3).




Figure 6: Standard deviation of wind power density (WPD) at 80 meters in 1976-2005, in  $\text{W m}^{-2}$  for the five points denoted in Fig. 1, during the (a) May-April-May (MAM) season and the (b) June-July-August (JJA) season. At each point, the boxplot on the left corresponds to the WPD estimates derived from the LENS; the boxplot points on the right correspond to 30 generated realizations of the proposed model. Because of the differences in scale, the respective boxplots for each season and dataset have been placed separately for Point 5 (c).

Figure 6 displays the standard deviation (SD) of the LENS and simulated seasonal WPD estimates for both seasons. Median differences across seasons and points tend to follow the fluctuations of the annual cycles denoted in Section 2, as higher wind speeds tend to be accompanied with greater variability. For instance, the median is nearly constant at Point 1, where the annual cycle experiences muted seasonal variation, but it more than doubles near the coastal areas of the Persian Gulf at Point 5, increasing from less than  $6 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  in MAM to almost  $15 \text{ W m}^{-2}$  in JJA. The fluctuations of the seasonal SD due to internal climate variability is shown to be

considerable. At Point 5, the SD of JJA WPD varies between 10 and 18  $Wm^{-2}$  across the 30 LENS realizations. At other points, the variation is smaller yet still relevant, as in Point 2 or 3 for MAM, where the highest value is nearly double that of the lowest. Comparing the values from the LENS with those implied by the model realizations suggests that the model reproduces the median and variability in seasonal WPD reasonably well during MAM, while negative biases arise in the median during JJA, especially at Point 5, where the bias reaches close to 6  $Wm^{-2}$ . Figure 7(b) shows how this bias also extends to the neighboring points along the Persian Gulf




Figure 7: Median standard deviation (SD) of 80 meter WPD, in  $Wm^{-2}$  for the (a,c) LENS dataset over May-April-May (MAM) and June-July-August (JJA) and the (b,d) differences with respect to the estimates derived from the 30 generated realizations. Selected points denoted in Fig. 1 are also depicted.

coastline. In JJA, the median SD (Fig. 7(c)), as represented in the LENS, displays a spatial pattern closely resembling that of the mean WPD shown in Fig. S.3. However, the generated realizations appear unable to adequately capture this rise in variability, as negative biases in excess of 6 and 2  $Wm^{-2}$  can be seen over the areas surrounding points 5 and 3, respectively. Analogous results apply to other quantiles, such as the 5% and 95% quantiles.

## 5 Discussion and Conclusions

This study proposed a model for daily wind speeds at multiple sites based on a multivariate skew- $t$  distribution. Most recent models developed for wind speed and the 2-dimensional wind field combine a Hidden Markov Model (HMM), to account for the influence of distinct weather regimes, with an autoregressive structure to capture the high degree of autocorrelation that is common in atmospheric flow. These Markov-Switching AutoRegressive (MS-AR) models have been shown to adequately represent the marginal distribution of daily wind speed, as the Markovian structure provides the flexibility necessary to capture its higher order moments. Recent efforts have attempted to extend this framework to the multisite setting; however, the number of sites is usually limited as inference quickly becomes problematic, in part due to the computationally demanding Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm that is used to deal with the latent Markov chain. Here we proposed a model that retains the vector-autoregressive structure, but that uses a neighbor-based scheme to reduce its dimensionality, and that replaces the latent weather regime process with a multivariate skew- $t$  distribution in the innovations to reproduce the observed skewness and excess kurtosis. The model was applied to a spatial domain of 148 points, which we partitioned into smaller regions of sizes ranging between 10 and 23 points where the assumption of stationarity is plausible, and we then performed the fit independently at each region. Our findings show that the model adequately matches the marginal distributions of daily wind speed, as well as the autocorrelation. However, the model shows some difficulty in matching the distribution of excursion durations above or below a high and low threshold, respectively,

especially when the degree of persistence between the two excursion types is markedly different. Adding seasonally varying vector-autoregressive coefficients or skew- $t$  parameters may partially alleviate this shortcoming. Further work will involve incorporating a latent process to account for the large-scale variation of the wind field. Preliminary work reveals that such variation can be incorporated by exploiting the fact that the multivariate skew- $t$  distribution is constructed from a multivariate skew-normal distribution, which has the convenient property that sums of it with a normal distribution remains within the skew-normal family.

The model was used to assess the sensitivity of wind resource potential in Saudi Arabia to the natural variability of the climate system. Studies devoted to the quantification of this resource have usually focused on the annual or seasonal mean wind speed, its temporal variability or the energy it can potentially provide as measured by WPD. A recent work by Yip et al. (2016) investigating the wind power potential of the Arabian Peninsula exceptionally considered other aspects, beyond its abundance, that are of particular relevance to the integration of wind energy into existing grid systems, such as the intermittency and persistence of the wind resource. To date, however, no study has addressed the impact of internal climate variability on wind energy related statistics, as its impact has only recently begun to be understood, thanks in part to projects such as the LENS that are designed to isolate its effects on the various earth system components. Our results, limited here to the variability of seasonal mean WPD based on 30 ensemble members from the LENS project, highlight the considerable effect of this source of variability on seasonal WPD. For instance, near the coastal areas of the Persian Gulf, the standard deviation of JJA WPD varies between 10 and 18  $Wm^{-2}$ . At other points further inland the variation is not as severe, but is still relevant. Further work will expand on this analysis to include other aspects related to WPD, along the lines of Yip et al. (2016). The accuracy of these WPD estimates are limited by the coarse horizontal resolution of the LENS dataset, of approximately  $1^\circ$ . In fact, we should expect to see departures from these as the resolution is refined, if only because of the better representation of the orography and the fine-scale processes

that affect the boundary layer dynamics. An indication of these potential discrepancies is given by a comparison between the mean JJA WPD at 80 meters and the findings of Yip et al. (2016), which tend to differ in terms of magnitude and spatial patterns, despite being based on annual means. For example, the authors identify the western mountains as offering more abundant wind resource than the Persian Gulf coastal areas, whereas here that is not the case. Accordingly, the estimates presented in this paper are intended to serve as useful references to guide further inquiries performed at finer resolution.

Ideally, climate centers should make projects such as the LENS regularly available to the research community at increasingly higher resolution to promote further analyses. However, projects of this magnitude, requiring scores of ensemble members, are costly from both a computational and a storage perspective. A cheaper alternative to running these numerical models is provided by stochastic weather generators, which attempt to reproduce the statistics of specific climate processes. The proposed model was fit to only three ensemble members, in order to assess its ability to reproduce the variability of the entire ensemble. Although some degree of underestimation was revealed over areas with abundant wind resource that warrants further study, it reasonably reproduced the variability of seasonal WPD, thus justifying its use as a potential stochastic generator of future wind speed time series based on projected paths of greenhouse gas emissions.

## Appendix: The Skew- $t$ Distribution

In this appendix we collect a series of relevant properties and results related to the skew- $t$  distribution.

If  $\mathbf{Y} = \boldsymbol{\xi} + \boldsymbol{\omega}\mathbf{Z}$ , with  $\mathbf{Z}$  being the standard  $ST_d$  variate, i.e.  $\mathbf{Z} \sim ST_d(\mathbf{0}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \nu)$ , then

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\mu} &= E(\mathbf{Y}) = \boldsymbol{\xi} + \boldsymbol{\omega}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z, \quad \nu > 1, \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma} &= \text{var}(\mathbf{Y}) = \frac{\nu}{\nu - 2}\boldsymbol{\Omega} - \boldsymbol{\omega}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\boldsymbol{\omega}, \quad \nu > 2,\end{aligned}$$

with  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z = b_\nu \boldsymbol{\delta}$ , where

$$b_\nu = \frac{\sqrt{\nu} \Gamma\left\{\frac{1}{2}(\nu - 1)\right\}}{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\nu\right)}, \quad \nu > 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\delta} = (1 + \boldsymbol{\alpha}^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} \boldsymbol{\alpha})^{-1/2} \bar{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} \boldsymbol{\alpha}.$$

Mardia's measure of multivariate kurtosis (Mardia, 1970), for a  $d$ -dimensional random variable  $\mathbf{X}$ , is given by

$$\gamma_2^M = E \left[ \{(\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu})^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\}^2 \right] - d(d + 2)$$

and for a  $ST_d$  variate, assuming that  $\nu > 4$ ,

$$\gamma_2^M = \frac{2d(d + 2)}{\nu - 4} + \frac{4(d + 2)}{(\nu - 3)(\nu - 4)} \beta_0^2 + 2 \left\{ \frac{2\nu}{(\nu - 3)b_\nu^2} - \frac{3(\nu - 3)^2 - 6}{(\nu - 3)(\nu - 4)} \right\} \beta_0^4$$

where  $\beta_0^2 = \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_0$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 = \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z$ .

## References

- Ailliot, P., Allard, D., Monbet, V., and Naveau, P. (2015a), “Stochastic weather generators: an overview of weather type models,” *Journal de la Société Française de Statistique*, 156, 101–113.
- Ailliot, P., Bessac, J., Monbet, V., and Pene, F. (2015b), “Non-homogeneous hidden Markov-switching models for wind time series,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 160, 75–88.
- Ailliot, P. and Monbet, V. (2012), “Markov-switching autoregressive models for wind time series,” *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 30, 92–101.
- Ailliot, P., Monbet, V., and Prevosto, M. (2006), “An autoregressive model with time-varying coefficients for wind fields,” *Environmetrics*, 17, 107–117.
- Arellano-Valle, R. B. and Azzalini, A. (2013), “The centred parameterization and related quantities of the skew-t distribution,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 113, 73–90.

- Azzalini, A. (1985), “A class of distributions which includes the normal ones,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 171–178.
- (2005), “The skew-normal distribution and related multivariate families,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 32, 159–188.
- (2016), *The R package **sn**: The Skew-Normal and Skew-t distributions (version 1.4-0)*, Università di Padova, Italia.
- Azzalini, A., Browne, R. P., Genton, M. G., and McNicholas, P. D. (2016), “On nomenclature for, and the relative merits of, two formulations of skew distributions,” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 110, 201–206.
- Azzalini, A. and Capitanio, A. (2003), “Distributions generated by perturbation of symmetry with emphasis on a multivariate skew t-distribution,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 65, 367–389.
- (2014), *The Skew-Normal and Related Families*, Cambridge University Press, IMS Monograph Series.
- Bessac, J., Ailliot, P., Cattiaux, J., and Monbet, V. (2016), “Comparison of hidden and observed regime-switching autoregressive models for (u, v)-components of wind fields in the Northeast Atlantic,” *Advances in Statistical Climatology, Meteorology and Oceanography*, 1, 1–16.
- Bessac, J., Ailliot, P., and Monbet, V. (2015), “Gaussian linear state-space model for wind fields in the Northeast Atlantic,” *Environmetrics*, 26, 29–38.
- Branco, M. D. and Dey, D. K. (2001), “A general class of multivariate skew-elliptical distributions,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 79, 99–113.
- Bruckner, T., Bashmakov, I., Mulugetta, Y., Chum, H., de la Vega Navarro, A., Edmonds, J., Faaij, A., Fungtammasan, B., Garg, A., Hertwich, E., et al. (2014), “Climate Change

- 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change,” in *Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge University Press Cambridge, United Kingdom/New York, NY, USA.
- DEA (2016), “The Danish Energy Model: Innovative, Efficient and Sustainable,” *Danish Energy Agency*.
- Deser, C., Phillips, A., Bourdette, V., and Teng, H. (2012), “Uncertainty in climate change projections: the role of internal variability,” *Climate Dynamics*, 38, 527–546.
- Deser, C., Phillips, A. S., Alexander, M. A., and Smoliak, B. V. (2014), “Projecting North American climate over the next 50 years: uncertainty due to internal variability,” *Journal of Climate*, 27, 2271–2296.
- Emeis, S. (2012), *Wind Energy Meteorology: Atmospheric Physics for Wind Power Generation*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Everitt, B. S., Landau, S., Leese, M., and Stahl, D. (2011), *Cluster Analysis*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, New York.
- Flecher, C., Naveau, P., Allard, D., and Brisson, N. (2010), “A stochastic daily weather generator for skewed data,” *Water Resources Research*, 46, n/a–n/a.
- Fuentes, M. (2001), “A high frequency kriging approach for non-stationary environmental processes,” *Environmetrics*, 12, 469–483.
- Fuentes, M. and Smith, R. L. (2001), “A new class of nonstationary spatial models,” Tech. rep., North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- Genton, M. G. (2004), *Skew-Elliptical Distributions and their Applications: A Journey Beyond Normality*, CRC Press.

- Gneiting, T. (2002), “Nonseparable, stationary covariance functions for space–time data,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 97, 590–600.
- González-Farías, G., Dominguez-Molina, J., and Gupta, A. (2004), “The Closed Skew-Normal Distribution,” in *Skew-Elliptical Distributions and their Applications: A Journey Beyond Normality*, ed. Genton, M. G., Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 25–42.
- Hering, A. S. and Genton, M. G. (2010), “Powering up with space-time wind forecasting,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105, 92–104.
- Hering, A. S., Kazor, K., and Kleiber, W. (2015), “A Markov-switching vector autoregressive stochastic wind generator for multiple spatial and temporal scales,” *Resources*, 4, 70–92.
- Higdon, D. (1998), “A process-convolution approach to modelling temperatures in the North Atlantic Ocean,” *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, 5, 173–190.
- KA-CARE (2012), “King Abdullah City for Atomic and Renewable Energy: Building the Renewable Energy Sector in Saudi Arabia,” *Report*.
- Kay, J., Deser, C., Phillips, A., Mai, A., Hannay, C., Strand, G., Arblaster, J., Bates, S., Danabasoglu, G., Edwards, J., et al. (2015), “The Community Earth System Model (CESM) Large Ensemble Project: A community resource for studying climate change in the presence of internal climate variability,” *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 96, 1333–1349.
- Kazor, K. and Hering, A. S. (2015), “Assessing the performance of model-based clustering methods in multivariate time series with application to identifying regional wind regimes,” *Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Statistics*, 20, 192–217.
- Lorente-Plazas, R., Montávez, J., Jimenez, P., Jerez, S., Gómez-Navarro, J., García-Valero, J., and Jimenez-Guerrero, P. (2015), “Characterization of surface winds over the Iberian Peninsula,” *International Journal of Climatology*, 35, 1007–1026.

- Mardia, K. V. (1970), “Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications,” *Biometrika*, 57, 519–530.
- Monbet, V. and Ailliot, P. (2017), “Sparse vector Markov switching autoregressive models. Application to multivariate time series of temperature,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 108, 40–51.
- Paciorek, C. J. and Schervish, M. J. (2006), “Spatial modelling using a new class of nonstationary covariance functions,” *Environmetrics*, 17, 483–506.
- Pinson, P. (2013), “Wind Energy: Forecasting Challenges for Its Operational Management,” *Statistical Science*, 28, 564–585.
- Rehman, S. and Ahmad, A. (2004), “Assessment of wind energy potential for coastal locations of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia,” *Energy*, 29, 1105–1115.
- Rehman, S., El-Amin, I., Ahmad, F., Shaahid, S., Al-Shehri, A., and Bakhashwain, J. (2007), “Wind power resource assessment for Rafha, Saudi Arabia,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 11, 937–950.
- Sampson, P. D. (2010), “Constructions for nonstationary spatial processes,” in *Handbook of Spatial Statistics*, eds. Gelfand, A. E., Diggle, P. J., Fuentes, M., and Guttorp, P., CRC/Chapman and Hall, pp. 119–130.
- Sampson, P. D. and Guttorp, P. (1992), “Nonparametric estimation of nonstationary spatial covariance structure,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87, 108–119.
- Shaahid, S., Al-Hadhrani, L. M., and Rahman, M. (2014), “Potential of establishment of wind farms in western province of Saudi Arabia,” *Energy Procedia*, 52, 497–505.
- Wilks, D. S. (2011), *Statistical Methods in the Atmospheric Sciences*, Academic Press.

- Wilks, D. S. and Wilby, R. L. (1999), “The weather generation game: a review of stochastic weather models,” *Progress in Physical Geography*, 23, 329–357.
- WWEA (2016), “WWEA Quarterly Bulletin Issue 1-206: Community Wind Special,” *World Wind Energy Association*.
- Yip, C. M. A., Gunturu, U. B., and Stenchikov, G. L. (2016), “Wind resource characterization in the Arabian Peninsula,” *Applied Energy*, 164, 826–836.
- Zhu, X. and Genton, M. G. (2012), “Short-Term Wind Speed Forecasting for Power System Operations,” *International Statistical Review*, 80, 2–23.